DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 216 EA 019 731

AUTHOR	Scott, James J.
TITLE	The Social and Organizational Context of Teaching. Annotated Bibliography.
INSTITUTION	North Central Regional Educational Lab., Elmhurst, IL.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jul 87
CONTRACT	400-86-0004
NOTE	36p.; Prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management under contract to NCREL. For other documents in the same series, see EA 019 726-730.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publication Sales, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1787 Agate St., Eugene, OR 97403 ($6.00); North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 295 Emroy Ave., Elmhurst, IL 60126 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131) -- Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization; Advisory Committees; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Improvement; Instructional Leadership; *Interprofessional Relationship; Participative Decision Making; Principals; School Based Management; School Effectiveness; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Morale; *Teacher Participation; *Teaching Conditions; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS	ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography was prepared to serve as background material for the writing of the synthesis paper "From Isolation to Collaboration: Improving the Work Environment of Teaching." Items were selected to represent the range of issues that pertain to the social and organizational context of teaching. The selected materials emphasize conditions over which teachers and administrators have some degree of control. For example, educators may not be able to alter the racial or socioeconomic composition of the student body or the condition of the school's physical plant, but teachers can learn to share their instructional expertise with one another and administrators can choose to solicit teachers' opinions when planning new programs or revising old ones. The bulk of the items were published during the last four years; only a few entries precede 1980. Most items were identified through a search of the ERIC database, but several items were obtained directly from scholars working in this area. (TE)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Social and Organizational Context of Teaching

Annotated Bibliography

James J. Scott

July 1987

Prepared for the
North Central Regional Educational Laboratory

by the
ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
University of Oregon

About ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several clearinghouses in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research results and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Resources in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $51.00 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Most of the documents listed in RIE can be purchased through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, operated by Computer Microfilm International Corporation.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $150.00 a year from Oryx Press, 2214 North Central at Encanto, Phoenix, Arizona 85004. Semiannual cumulations can be ordered separately.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, monographs, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

Introduction

This annotated bibliography was prepared to serve as background material for the writing of a synthesis paper, published separately under the title *From Isolation to Collaboration: Improving the Work Environment of Teaching*, by James J. Scott and Stuart C. Smith.

Items in this bibliography were selected to represent the range of issues that pertain to the social and organizational context of teaching. In keeping with the thrust of the synthesis paper, the selection of materials emphasizes conditions over which teachers and administrators have some degree of control. Educators, for example, may not be able to alter the racial or socioeconomic composition of the student body or the condition of the school's physical plant, but teachers can learn to share their instructional expertise with one another and administrators can choose to solicit teachers' opinions when planning new programs or revising old ones.

The bulk of items were published during the last four years; only a handful of entries precede 1980. Most items were identified through a search of the ERIC database. In addition, several particularly useful items (including a few that are not yet published) were obtained directly from scholars working in this area.

The Social and Organizational Context of Teaching

Alfonso, Robert J., and Goldsberry, Lee. "Colleagueship in Supervision." In *Supervision of Teaching*, edited by Thomas J. Sergiovanni. 90-107. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Alfonso and Goldsberry point out that in most schools the large number of teachers makes it impossible for a principal to directly supervise them effectively, especially in the area of teacher improvement. If this is the case, where can the principal turn to for assistance?

The answer, according to Alfonso and Goldsberry, is the teachers themselves. While acknowledging that a colleague-supervisor is, strictly speaking, a contradiction in terms, they argue that teachers can assist the principal in such areas as curriculum development and teacher improvement.

The authors suggest three specific ways in which a principal can mobilize the teaching staff as a resource for improving curriculum and teaching practices: teacher committees to address particular problems, clinical supervision (in which teachers are trained to observe other teachers and assist them to improve), and formal teacher intervisitation (which differs from clinical supervision in that it requires less training and the teachers exchange visits with one another as equals, rather than having one teacher be an advisor to the other).

Alfonso and Goldsberry do not argue that such formal practices provide all of the interaction between principal and teachers and among teachers needed to promote teaching improvement. Rather, they argue that such formal practices are necessary first steps toward increased colleagueship in the schools.

Ashton, Patricia T., and Webb, Rodman B. *Making a Difference: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Student Achievement.* New York: Longman, 1986. 225 pages.

Ashton and Webb believe that "the single greatest impediment to school improvement" is "the crisis in teacher motivation." Claiming that many studies have mentioned this problem but none has actually analyzed it, the authors attempt "to (1) describe a program of research that examined the motivation problems that jeopardize the teaching profession and (2) suggest an approach to educational reform that addresses the motivation problems teachers face."

In their chapter on "School Organization and Teachers' Sense of Efficacy," Ashton and Webb discuss their studies of one junior high school and one middle school. The junior high school was organized along traditional lines, with teachers divided into departments according to academic discipline, with class composition determined by grade level and subject matter, and with each teacher operating independently of other teachers. In contrast, the middle school was organized according to team teaching principles; each team of four or five teachers from different disciplines was responsible for a group of 120 to 170 sixth, seventh, and eighth graders. Members of a team worked together to plan their schedules, design curriculums, and solve student problems.

Although the primary purpose of the authors' study was to develop a tentative hypothesis regarding the relationship between a school's formal organization and teachers' sense of efficacy, this particular chapter serves to illustrate differences between those practices that characterize norms of isolation and those that characterize norms of collaboration. In the junior high school, where norms of isolation prevailed, both teachers and administrators considered teaching to be the job of teachers operating individually and policy-making to be the job of administrators. In the middle school, where norms of collaboration prevailed, both teachers and administrators regarded both teaching and policy-making as collegial activities: teachers shared their ideas and planned their work-days together, and--although the principal had the last say in matters of school policy--teacher input played a significant role in the policy-making process.

Bacharach, Samuel B., and Mitchell, Stephen M. *Old Wine in New Bottles: The Quality of Work Life in Schools and School Districts.* Ithaca, New York: School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, State University of New York. 1983. 17 pages. ED 243 178 (also found in *Consensus and Power in School Organizations: Final Report*, ED 243 174).

Asserting that traditional management ideologies fail to deal with responses of the workers, the authors describe and forcefully argue for a "quality of work life" approach to labor management in the schools. Such an approach has three characteristics:

1. study of the relations among the individual (the teacher), the group (the school), and the organization (the district)
2. analysis of organization structure, focusing on the structure's impact on the particular tasks teachers perform
3. analysis of how teachers perceive their roles and modification of organizational structure to take those perceptions into account

The most appealing aspect of the "quality of work life" approach is its flexibility. Bacharach and Mitchell emphasize that "quality of work life" is an *approach* to structuring organizations rather than a model of a structure to be imposed on such organizations. That is, each organization should use data derived from studies of interactions among its own particular components (teacher, school, district) to develop structures best suited to its own particular needs.

Bacharach, Samuel B., and others. *Strategic Choice and Collective Action: Organizational Determinants of Teachers Militancy.* Ithaca, New York: School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, State University of New York, 1983. 47 pages. ED 243 182 (also found in *Consensus and Power in School Organizations: Final Report*, ED 243 174).

To identify organizational factors that contribute to teacher militancy, the authors surveyed teachers throughout the New York State system. They found that administrators' failure to include teachers in decision-making processes correlated with teacher militancy. At the same time, however, they found that bureaucratization *per se* did not correlate with militancy (the authors speculate that teachers may be willing to accept a high degree of bureaucratization as a tradeoff for certainty about their teaching roles.)

More important, perhaps, to educators studying the organizational context of teaching are the findings regarding the relative importance attached to professional and compensation issues by primary and secondary teachers. At the primary level, teachers seemed to be more concerned with professional issues; at the secondary level, they seemed to be more concerned over issues of compensation. The authors hypothesize that elementary teachers still see themselves engaged in a struggle to achieve recognition as professionals, whereas high school teachers see themselves as having already won such recognition.

Bird, Tom, and Little, Judith Warren. "How Schools Organize the Teaching Occupation." *The Elementary School Journal*, 86,4 (March 1986): 493-511.

In the view of Bird and Little, effective schooling is a community project: the general public, education reformers, administrators, and teachers all must participate in varying degrees. The external environment has a right--even a duty--to make demands of the schools, but that right carries with it an obligation to provide schools with the resources they need to meet those demands. The core of Bird and Little's article is a series of suggestions about ways in which teachers, administrators, and other interested parties can work together to improve schools.

According to the authors, the most important resource for school improvement is time: "time for teachers to study, analyze, and advance their practice; time for principals, department heads, and teacher leaders to support improvement; time for faculties to examine, debate, and improve their norms of civility, instruction, and improvement." Making such time available will, of course, require support from district personnel and the community.

Because the authors see the individual school as the principal vehicle for change and improvement, a number of their proposals are targeted at the individual school. For example, they suggest that, when district administrators hire a new principal, they should do so with a specific school in mind and should actually visit and study the school to ensure that its needs and the abilities of the principal match up. And, because beginning teachers are heavily influenced by the environment in which they teach, the authors propose that school district personnel should assign beginning teachers to those schools that have the strongest norms for improvement.

The authors' other suggestions include closer interactions between schools and colleges of education (a college that uses a particular school for practice teaching could reciprocate by providing inservice training at the school) and education researchers sharing their knowledge with the particular schools where their research is conducted.

Bird, Tom, and Little, Judith Warren. *Instructional Leadership in Eight Secondary Schools.* Final Report. Boulder, Colorado: Center for Action Research, Inc., June 1985. 281 pages. ED 263 694.

Proposals to improve instructional leadership are of little value unless they are grounded in knowledge of what instructional leaders actually do. As a step toward obtaining such knowledge, Bird and Little conducted case studies of five secondary schools and used the results of those case studies to develop questionnaires that they then submitted to administrators and teachers at those five schools plus three more. The authors' primary concern was determining what effective instructional leaders do, why it works, and teachers' perceptions of instructional leaders and their effect upon teaching.

Bird and Little found that one key element in effective instructional leadership is reciprocity. Leaders must assert and *display* the knowledge and skill needed to help teachers improve, and teachers, in turn, must defer to the leader's assertion and respond to it by trying out suggestions made by the leader. At the same time, leaders who expect teachers to improve at teaching must themselves improve at leading. This principle of reciprocity applies to virtually all relationships between leaders and those

whom they lead--whether the leaders are administrators or "teacher leaders" and whether the subject is teacher evaluation or the implementation of new programs or teaching practices.

The authors also found that practical material support for desired practices was more important than they had thought when they commenced their study. The most vigorous instructional leaders "organized themselves, their offices, and the resources of the school specifically to meet the requirements of the practices which they espoused." Whether it was a photocopier or more time in the schedule for teachers to work together, the vigorous leaders attempted to make sure it was provided.

Finally, Bird and Little found that, although isolation and independence among teachers was the *prevailing* pattern in most schools, it was not the approved pattern. Where such a pattern has been in place for many years and teachers are uncertain about the benefits to be gained from closer interaction among themselves and between themselves and administrators, then teachers will be apprehensive about shifting to a more collaborative pattern. But those teachers in more isolated settings who were surveyed consistently indicated they would respond favorably to more collaborative settings *if*, through such means as positive behavior modeling on the part of instructional leaders, they saw potential benefits to be obtained from working in the collaborative settings.

Chubb, John E., and Moe, Terry M. "Politics, Markets, and the Organization of Schools." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans, August 28-September 1, 1985. 45 pages plus appendices and bibliography. ED 263 674.

Operating on the assumption that James Coleman and associates may be right in their assertion that Catholic school student achievement substantially outstrips that of public school students, Chubb and Moe explored differences between Catholic and public high schools to see if they could develop plausible explanations for the superior performance of the Catholic schools. This resulting paper offers disturbing--but potentially fruitful--implications for educators interested in improving the academic performance of the public schools.

Chubb and Moe drew on the High School and Beyond study of over a thousand schools and their own survey of administrators and teachers at approximately 500 of those schools to identify differences among the public school environment, the Catholic school environment, the environments of other private schools, and the environments of elite private schools. While some differences are obvious (private schools have greater control over who attends them, and parents of private school children are more supportive

than those of public school children), other, more important differences surfaced.

Foremost among the differences between public and private schools is the relationship between the school and its environment. Outside forces (school boards, parents, state officials) exert far more influence over public schools than they do over private schools. Consequently, public school principals spend far more of their time dealing with management and administration matters than private school principals need to spend.

Perhaps as a consequence of the above, public school principals tend to have more experience and interest in administration than do their private school counterparts. Conversely, private school principals tend to have more experience and interest in teaching and instructional leadership than do their public school counterparts. And because private school principals are more interested in and involved in instructional leadership, they more easily gain the respect and trust of teachers. Such mutual trust, in turn, encourages teachers to work with one another to improve their teaching.

Clearly, if Chubb and Moe are correct in their analysis, educators interested in improving the quality of public education must take a hard look at the relationship between public schools and their environment.

Cohen, Elizabeth D., and Miller, Russell H. "Coordination and Control of Instruction in Schools." *Pacific Sociological Review*, 23,4 (October 1980): 446-73.

The authors suggest that, under normal circumstances, schools function most effectively when close control over and coordination of instruction are not exercised. However, they hypothesize that, when schools are subject to pressure from outside sources (such as state and federally mandated programs that demand accountability), they respond by imposing closer coordination and control on their teachers.

To test their hypothesis, Cohen and Miller analyzed data drawn from two sets of elementary schools--one set that had participated in California's Early Childhood Education Program and one set that had not. They found that, as predicted by the hypothesis, greater coordination among teachers and between teachers and principals were achieved in those schools that participated in the program than in those that did not. However, contrary to their hypothesis, they found that the principals of those schools participating in the program exercised no more formal authority over their teachers than did the principals of schools not participating in the program.

The authors note that analyses of organizations often treat coordination and control as if they meant the same thing. On the basis of their study, Cohen and Miller suggest that future research should focus on the difference between the two concepts.

Coleman, Peter. "Towards More Effective Schools: Improving School Climate." *Administrator's Notebook*, 31, 4 (1983). EJ 311 698.

Over a two-year period, Coleman administered a project intended to improve the educational climate of nine British Columbia elementary schools. While readily conceding that not enough data were available to draw definitive conclusions, he suggests that his preliminary findings both "support and are supported by other research" in school climate and effectiveness. Thus he attempts "to clarify an emerging pattern of research" in the field.

The author cites three findings generated by his project that corroborate earlier major studies: (1) the school is the "vital unit" for educational reform, more important than either the school district as a whole or the individual classroom; (2) the principal is the key figure in school improvement, and (3) "norms of collegiality and continuous improvement are clearly essential to school self-renewal." As a corollary to these findings, Coleman emphasizes the need for central school district personnel to "*develop* and *protect* the autonomy of schools" (Coleman's italics).

In addition to Coleman's findings, his methodology is worth noting. First, teachers and parents were surveyed to determine their perceptions of school climate and how it needed to be improved. Second, the principals themselves were divided into two teams to analyze the results of the surveys--with no principal seeing the surveys done for his or her own school. In this way, the principals (the primary agents of change) could get a clear view of what changes their clients (teachers and parents) felt needed to be made.

Common, Dianne L. "Power: The Missing Concept in the Dominant Model of School Change." *Theory into Practice*, 22, 3 (Summer 1983): 203-10. EJ 289 019.

Common notes that the individual teacher has the power to block or facilitate educational innovations. All too often, educational reformers and administrators fail to take that power into account when designing and attempting to implement new programs. In response, teachers use their power to block innovations and maintain the status quo.

Common suggests that educational reformers and administrators collaborate with teachers when designing and implementing new

programs. If teachers see themselves as having a role in developing such programs, they will use their power to facilitate implementation instead of to resist it.

Cox, Harold, and Wood, James R. "Organizational Structure and Professional Alienation: The Case of Public School Teachers." *Peabody Journal of Education*, 58,1 (October 1980): 1-6. EJ 239 484.

Drawing on earlier research identifying features of a bureaucratic organization frustrating to professionals, Cox and Wood developed a questionnaire designed to find out whether these same factors--rigidity of the organizational hierarchy of authority, lack of participation in decision-making processes, job codification, and rigid enforcement of rules--correlated with teacher alienation. They used the questionnaire to collect data from 278 teachers in a midwestern city of 80,000 people.

They found statistically significant correlations between teacher alienation and all four factors. Noting that teachers increasingly view themselves as professionals, the authors speculate that teacher alienation will continue to increase as the desire of school boards to retain control over subordinates conflicts with the desire of teachers for a degree of freedom and a share in decision-making processes consistent with their professional status.

Cuban, Larry. "Persistent Instruction: Another Look at Constancy in the Classroom." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68,1 (September 1986): 7-11. EJ 341 126.

Cuban speculates that the implementation of state-mandated educational goals and the use of statewide minimum competency testing to monitor student performance may impede the development of student reasoning and problem-solving skills and may prevent further development of teaching as a profession.

The author suggests that teachers may respond to statewide minimum competency testing by spending more time on lectures, giving more seatwork assignments, and requiring students to do more rote recitation. As a consequence, less time would be spent on class discussions, small-group sessions, and one-on-one interactions between teacher and student--activities that enhance reasoning and problem-solving skills.

As a corollary, Cuban suggests that standardized educational goals and standardized testing may lead to standardized teaching: a concept at odds with the concept of teaching as a profession requiring "invention, imagination, performance, and orchestration."

David, Jane L., and Peterson, Susan M. *Can Schools Improve Themselves? A Study of School-Based Improvement Programs.* Palo Alto, California: Bay Area Research Group, 1984. 90 pages. ED 262 119.

To assess the effectiveness of school-based improvement programs, David and Peters studied six such programs at thirty-two schools in seventeen school districts scattered throughout seven states. Although the programs originated at three different levels (district, state, and federal), they shared two characteristics in common. First, the programs were targeted at the school as a whole, rather than at a particular aspect of the curriculum or a particular subset of the school population. Second, individual schools were granted considerable latitude in determining what goals they wanted to achieve and how they were going to achieve them.

The results of the study were mixed. On the one hand, the authors found that in most cases (but not all) the tendency was for school staff to focus on areas, such as discipline and community relations, that were not directly connected with instructional improvement. On the other, staff were willing and able to work with one another on a continuous basis in the areas on which they did decide to focus.

The authors' conclusions are cautiously optimistic. They suggest that, because school-based planning has brought about improvement in noninstructional areas, there is reason to hope that, over time, it can lead to improvement in instruction as well.

Fraser, Barry J., and Rentoul, A. John. "Relationships between School-Level and Classroom-Level Environments." *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 28,3 (September 1982): 212-25. EJ 270 132.

Fraser and Rentoul note that, while considerable research has been done on school-level environments and on classroom-level environments, very little has been done on relationships between the two. Speculating that such relationships may be significant, the authors correlated School-level Environment Questionnaires with Individualized Classroom Environment Questionnaires. They assert that they found a number of statistically significant correlations, citing as an example a strong correlation between high scores for formalization on the School-level Environment Questionnaire and low scores for participation, independence, and differentiation on the Individualized Classroom Environment Questionnaire.

Herriott, Robert E., and Firestone, William A. *Two Images of Schools as Organizations: A Replication and Elaboration.* Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., June 1983. 23 pages. ED 245 338.

The authors examined questionnaires returned by teachers from 111 schools to see if there was any correlation between school level (grade school, junior high, and high school) and the extent of goal consensus and centralization of influence within the school. They found that the extent of goal consensus and centralization of influence was much higher in grade schools than in high schools.

This difference has important implications for attempts to implement in high schools reforms that have been successful in grade schools.

Knoop, Robert, and O'Reilly, Robert R. *Job Satisfaction of Teachers and Organizational Effectiveness of Elementary Schools.* 1978. 25 pages. ED 177 719.

To identify factors affecting teacher job satisfaction, Knoop and O'Reilly surveyed 311 teachers from 75 elementary schools. The teachers were asked to rate their satisfaction with five aspects of their jobs: the work itself, pay, promotional prospects, supervision, and coworkers. They were also asked to rate the effectiveness of teaching in their schools.

The authors found no statistically significant correlation between satisfaction with pay or promotional prospects and teachers' perception of teaching effectiveness in their schools. They did, however, find significant correlations between satisfaction with the work itself, coworkers, and supervision and perceptions of teaching effectiveness. They conclude that, for elementary school teachers, intrinsic rewards (the work itself, relationships with coworkers and supervisors) are more important than extrinsic rewards.

Kozuch, Joyce A. "Implementing an Educational Innovation: The Constraints of the School Setting." *High School Journal*, 62,5 (February 1979): 223-31. EJ 207 568.

Although educational innovations are usually introduced by the principal or school board, actual implementation is usually in the hands of the teachers. Drawing on a case study of a junior high school where teachers failed to effectively implement a change from letter grades to a nonevaluative grading system, Kozuch discusses constraints on the implementation of educational innovations.

She discusses such factors as relationships between faculty and administration and the perceived roles of teachers and students. But her most enlightening finding involves constraints posed by the classroom setting itself. In this instance, teachers initially approved of the idea of descriptive, nonevaluative means of assessing student performance, but soon found out that in practice they needed letter grades for motivational and discipline purposes. Without formal rewards for good work and good behavior, students lacked the incentive to work and behave themselves. Both their work and behavior suffered accordingly.

Not surprisingly, Kozuch generalizes that constraints such as those imposed by the classroom setting should be considered *before* innovative practices are adopted.

Lieberman, Ann, and Miller, Lynne. *Teachers, Their World, and Their Work: Implications for School Improvement.* Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984. 145 pages. ED 250 285.

Operating on the assumption that meaningful educational reforms depend on an understanding of what actually goes on in the classroom, Lieberman and Miller set out "to begin to describe, in a general sense, what it is like to be a teacher." To accomplish that end, they describe a day in the life of a primary teacher from the time the first students arrive in the morning until the last student leaves in the afternoon; they discuss the problems secondary teachers encounter in dealing with a complex bureaucracy and with troubled adolescents; and they take us through the work week of an assistant principal trying to mediate disputes between teachers and students, trying to mollify angry parents, and, in general, trying to keep things running smoothly. In so doing, they show us the inherently chaotic nature of the world in which teachers and school administrators must do their work.

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the world described by Lieberman and Miller is the sense of isolation that pervades it. In most schools, under most circumstances, teachers do their work alone, interacting with their students but engaging in few if any meaningful interactions with their peers.

"With so many people engaged in so common a mission in so compact a space and time, it is perhaps the greatest irony--and the greatest tragedy of teaching--that so much is carried on in self-imposed and professionally sanctioned isolation."

In their last chapter, Lieberman and Miller discuss means to provide for the continuing growth of teachers. They stress that teacher education programs must be strong in both content and delivery, and both of these areas must be geared to address the

needs and concerns of teachers.

Little, Judith Warren. "Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of School Success." *American Educational Research Journal*, 19,3 (Fall 1982): 325-340. EJ 275 511.

To gain "insight into some of the ways in which the social organization of the school as a *workplace* bears on teachers' involvement in formal or informal occasions of 'learning on the job'," Little examined workplace conditions at six schools. She interviewed members of the school district's central staff, principals, and teachers. She also observed interactions among teachers and between teachers and principals in virtually all of the workplace conditions possible--in the classroom, in staff development meetings, even on the playgrounds.

Little found that, whatever the school's degree of participation in formal staff development programs, real "learning on the job" is most evident where the following crucial interactions take place:

1. "Teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly precise talk about teaching practice," rather than swapping stories about problem children, personal foibles of other teachers, and the like.
2. "Teachers are frequently observed and provided with useful (if potentially frightening) critiques of their teaching."
3. Teachers work together to plan and design their classes.
4. Teachers teach each other about teaching.

Little's study offers solid support for the idea that conditions within the individual school--particularly the interactions between the principal and the teachers and among the teachers--exert a strong effect on the teacher's ability to "learn on the job."

Little, Judith Warren. "Seductive Images and Organizational Realities in Professional Development." Chapter 3 of *Rethinking School Improvement: Research, Craft, and Concept*, edited by Ann Lieberman. 26-44. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1986.

This "exercise in healthy skepticism" explores the implications of differing results generated by two staff development programs for school teachers. Both programs were designed by the same specialist, both focused on the same teaching practices, and both were praised by participants. Yet, three years after they were launched, one continued to exert a profound effect upon its participants, ranging from "widespread implementation of new practices" and "renewed professional commitment among experienced

teachers" to "changes in the routine organization of school life." The other had little long-term effect: "As a meaningful contributor to a professional repertoire, it was virtually inconsequential."

One obvious difference between the two programs that helps to explain why one failed and one succeeded lies in the extent and duration of the programs. In the less successful program, teachers participated in a training session, followed by one or two classroom visits by the staff development specialist. In the more successful program, teachers and principals were committed to a training session followed by *three years* of working with the staff developer to implement the program. Clearly, the difference in extent and duration of commitment would go a long way toward explaining the difference in success between the two programs.

However, Little suggests another, more subtle factor that played a role in the one program's success: collaboration involving teachers, their principals, and the staff development coordinators. To be eligible for the successful program, a principal needed to gain the backing of 75 percent of the faculty before training even began, meaning that the principal and faculty shared a commitment from the very beginning. During the training sessions, staff developers and teachers worked together to hammer out the specifics of the program to be implemented. And during the years of implementation, the teachers, principal, and staff development coordinator worked together to ensure that the program had the best chance possible of succeeding.

Little suggests that it "is simply implausible that a small cadre of staff developers in any district will add measurably to the general fund of teachers' knowledge, skill, and enthusiasm." Rather, in her view, the very elements that ensured the one program's success--collaboration among teachers and between teachers and their principal--are the same elements essential to the success of "the day-to-day work of teaching."

Little, Judith Warren. "Teachers as Teacher Advisors: The Delicacy of Collegial Leadership." *Educational Leadership*, 43,3 (November 1985): 34-36. EJ 329 579.

The practice of teachers observing one another in the classroom and giving and receiving feedback offers considerable promise for improving teaching. At the same time, such a practice can be frightening, as teachers are exposing their weaknesses, along with their strengths, to their colleagues.

Little describes her observations of a Teacher Advisor Project conducted in Marin County, California. Because the roles of the advisors closely resemble those projected for master teachers and for senior teachers in career ladders, her observations have

widespread applications.

The author found that it took time and hard work for advisors to win the acceptance and respect necessary to persuade teachers to interact effectively with them. Only after advisors had helped teachers outside of the classroom were teachers willing to let advisors witness teaching. And Little found that teachers and advisors alike felt more comfortable when advisors acted as facilitators rather than leaders (that is, when advisors assisted teachers in doing what they wanted to do already, rather than telling teachers what they should be doing).

Although Little does not attempt to draw firm conclusions from her observations, she does suggest that administrators bear in mind the distinction between leading and facilitating when designing career ladders and master teacher programs.

Lortie, Dan C. *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1975. 284 pages.

Lortie notes that, while educators have devoted considerable energy to curriculum reform and instructional innovations, little attention has been paid to teachers--the ones who ultimately determine what goes on in the classroom. To remedy this situation, Lortie surveyed teachers in five towns in Massachusetts, supplementing the survey with his own observations of teachers in Dade County, Florida.

He found that, for most of the teachers surveyed, intrinsic rewards of the profession were considerably more important than extrinsic ones. Promotions and pay increases mattered less than the teacher's perception that he or she was being successful in helping students to learn.

As a corollary, Lortie found that teachers placed a very high value on their relationships with students and assigned little value to their relationships with what might be called outsiders--other teachers, the principal, and parents. When asked to describe a good day at school, teachers invariably discussed things that had taken place in the classroom with students. When teachers brought up the subject of interactions with other members of the school community, it was usually in a negative context--other teachers shirking duties such as monitoring the hallways, the principal using the public announcement system to interrupt classes, and parents interfering in the classroom. Along similar lines, he found that teachers generally held what appeared to be paradoxical norms of autonomy--on the one hand, they wanted to be left alone in the classroom, but on the other, they wanted access to the expertise of others when needed.

In speculating about the future role of classroom teachers,

Lortie raised some disturbing questions. As state and federal governments become increasingly involved in education, it appears likely that increased bureaucratization of the schools and a corresponding diminishing of the teacher's role as a professional will result. How can teachers resist such encroachment on their position when (1) they lack the norms of collegiality generally associated with professions and (2) they do not contribute in any formal, organized fashion to the advancement of their profession (that is, research on effective teaching is done by academics, not by classroom teachers)?

While Lortie provides no answers to the first part of the question, he does offer an intriguing proposal to deal with the second. Far-sighted school district personnel could encourage the development of the position of teacher-researcher. Teachers at the primary and secondary level could conceivably function in a manner analogous to that of college professors--teaching their subject and engaging in research designed to improve teaching.

McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin, and others. "Why Teachers Won't Teach." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67,6 (February 1986): 420-26. EJ 333 048.

According to McLaughlin and associates, "competent teachers--indeed, some of our most talented teachers--believe that they can't, and thus won't teach." To explain why this is the case, the authors draw on interviews with eighty-five teachers from five school districts in the San Francisco Bay area.

The result is a catalog of teacher complaints about the schools and school districts as support systems for effective teaching. Teachers complained about classes that were too large to permit effective individualized instruction. They complained about lack of teaching materials and about failure of administrators to establish and support effective discipline measures. And they complained about isolation and lack of recognition on the job. In addition, new teachers reported that they were frequently assigned to the most difficult jobs available--those that more experienced teachers didn't want--rather than those to which they were best suited.

The authors conclude that, for reforms to be effective, they should concentrate in five areas: parental support, buffering of teachers, feedback, professional development, and new teacher needs.

McNeely, R.L. "Organizational Patterns, Work, and Burnout in the Public School." *Urban Education*, 18,1 (April 1983): 82-97. EJ 282 264.

In recent years, teacher burnout has become a serious problem in school districts throughout the country. McNeely hypothesizes that a major factor in burnout is the organizational structure of the school.

The author describes two models for organizational structures. The rationalistic model emphasizes decision-making authority at the top, impersonal relationships among members of the organization, and rules to be followed in performing tasks. The human relations model emphasizes collegial decision-making, personalized relations, and internalization of organizational goals (performance is governed by the individual's understanding of the organization's goals, rather than by rules to be followed unquestioningly.)

McNeely suggests that many school districts have developed overly rationalistic structures that deny teachers the opportunity to make decisions, employ their professional expertise, and feel that they are making a meaningful contribution to the school. Such conditions can lead to teacher burnout.

The solution to the problem, in McNeely's view, is for schools to move toward more human relations oriented structures that give teachers a greater role in decision-making, more opportunities to exercise their professional expertise, and a greater sense of community with their fellow teachers.

Metz, Mary Haywood. *Different by Design: The Context and Character of Three Magnet Schools.* New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986. 267 pages.

To "identify important influences in the shaping of magnet schools and innovative schools more broadly," Metz conducted case studies of three magnet middle schools in Heartland--her pseudonymn for a Midwestern industrial city with a population of approximately 500,000. Among the influences she identifies are the federal government, the school district's contract with the local teacher union, and parents' relationships with the schools.

The magnet school program owed its very existence to a federal court order mandating the end of *de facto* segregation in Heartland's schools. By encouraging parents of all races to send their children to magnet schools, Heartland officials hoped to comply with the court order without resorting to forced busing.

The contract with the local teacher union influenced the composition of the faculties at the schools studied. Both Adams Avenue and Jesse Owens were new schools; consequently, they were staffed by volunteers and by younger teachers from other schools who had little seniority. In contrast, what became the Horace Mann Middle School started as a program at an existing junior high

(Atlantic Avenue). Consequently, Horace Mann was staffed by older faculty members who had been teaching at Atlantic Avenue before the conversion to a magnet program took place. In effect, the principals at Adams Avenue and Jesse Owens had an opportunity to work with young, inexperienced teachers to forge new faculty cultures, whereas the principal at Horace Mann was compelled to work with a faculty culture that was already firmly in place.

Students at both Adams Avenue and Jesse Owens came primarily from families of average to below-average educational backgrounds and socioeconomic status. At both schools, parents and teachers considered themselves united behind the common goal of giving the students a special education. In contrast, most of the students at Horace Mann (a program targeted at the talented and gifted) came from families with above-average educational backgrounds and socioeconomic status. The parents tended to look down on the teachers, whom they considered to be incompetent to teach talented and gifted children.

Perhaps the most important service Metz performs is to show the ways in which policy decisions can produce unintended consequences. For example, the talented and gifted program at Atlantic Avenue was transferred to the Horace Mann High School's building to achieve racial balance at the high school's site. The resulting close proximity between middle school and high school students and teachers produced tensions that had negative effects on the middle school program.

Metz, Mary Haywood. "Teachers' Pride in Craft, School Subcultures, and Societal Pressures." *Educational Policy*, 1,1 (1987): 115-34.

Metz reasons that teachers need to feel pride in their work and that, for most teachers, this pride is collectively defined by the teacher subculture within the school. This case study of a magnet middle school shows what can happen when administrators and parents fail to take that pride and the sources for it into account.

As a group, students at Horace Mann were more advanced academically than most, and they were "generally pleasant and cooperative toward adults." Yet "the dominant majority of Mann's faculty were angry and bitter and took their feelings out in psychic withdrawal from the school and from their teaching."

Metz suggests that the faculty's behavior was a reaction to a number of forces that combined to mount an assault on their pride in their teaching. These included the way in which the magnet program was implemented and the attitudes of central office administrators and of parents toward the teachers.

In its first year, the magnet program consisted of seventy talented seventh graders from around the city; they shared the school with eighth graders drawn from the neighborhood. Certain members of the faculty were singled out to teach the seventh graders, while the rest "were literally forbidden to have any contact with" them. This method of implementing the program (inevitably implying that most of the teachers weren't really capable of teaching talented and gifted students) aroused feelings of resentment in those teachers not selected--feelings that lingered on after the program had been expanded to include the sixth and eighth grades and all of the teachers were involved.

Those feelings were exacerbated by the attitudes of parents and central office administrators toward the teachers. Both groups made it clear they felt that this particular faculty--which had formerly taught a student body known for its violence and vandalism--was incompetent to teach talented and gifted students. Faced with these negative expectations, the faculty as a group decided that no one could teach under such circumstances and, in effect, quit trying.

The implications of Metz's study are disturbing. Not all schools are like Horace Mann, and not all faculties are like the one Metz's studied. But faculties in schools across the country are facing increased pressures as administrators and parents demand more of them. If those demands are made without taking teacher pride into account, then teaching and learning will suffer.

Miller, William C. "Staff Morale, School Climate, and Educational Productivity." *Educational Leadership*, 38,6 (March 1981): 483-86. EJ 243 839.

Miller cites considerable research to show that morale, school climate, and productivity in the classroom are inextricably intertwined. A relatively open climate, according to Miller, improves both morale and productivity.

Miller includes a list of suggestions for activities to improve morale. These range from providing leadership development programs for administrators to utilizing *Magic Circle* techniques in elementary school classrooms.

Miskel, Cecil G., and others. "Organizational Structures and Processes, Perceived School Effectiveness, Loyalty, and Job Satisfaction." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15,3 (Fall 1979): 97-118. EJ 215 952.

The authors used the Structural Properties Questionnaire, the Profile of a School Form 3, and the Index of Effectiveness to

measure possible correlations among organizational structures and processes, perceived school effectiveness, loyalty, and job satisfaction. The results illustrate both the possibilities and the difficulties inherent in attempting to determine the relationship among a range of variables in the school setting.

As their preliminary hypothesis had indicated, they found positive correlation between organizational processes (informal interactions among school personnel at all levels) and perceived organizational effectiveness, loyalty, and job satisfaction. However, contrary to the original hypothesis, formalization and standardization--both of which were expected to correlate negatively with perceived organizational effectiveness--correlated positively.

The authors conclude that effective schools, in the perception of teachers, are ones with participative organizational processes, relatively decentralized decision-making structures, and high levels of professional activity. At the same time, they conclude that the successful school has highly formalized general rules. Finally, they conclude that environmental variables "exhibit more complex and variegated effects than their treatment in the recent educational administration literature suggests."

National Education Association and National Association of Secondary School Principals. *Ventures in Good Schooling: A Cooperative Model for a Successful Secondary School.* Washington, DC: NEA, and Reston, VA: NASSP, 1986. 28 pages. ED 272 977.

Recognizing "that present circumstances demand a renewed sense of interdependence among all educators," in spring 1985 the NEA and NASSP appointed a committee of principals and teachers "to develop a practical tool that would help teachers and principals examine their responsibilities to create a quality instructional program at the school site." This booklet is the result.

The booklet focuses on six areas of school life: Purpose and Goals of the School; School Organization and Climate; Classroom Instruction; Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel Development; Student Achievement and Behavior; and Family and Community Relationships. In each area, the booklet provides a number of indicators denoting characteristics of effective schools. For example, in the area of school goals and purposes, two of the indicators are "The principal provides the opportunity for the faculty to participate in identifying the purposes, priorities, and goals of the school" and "The principal involves the faculty in the decision-making process before decisions are finalized."

In effect, the booklet provides principals and teachers with a checklist of practices that have been found to be effective. By working together, principals and teachers can incorporate into

their own schools those of the practices that fit their particular needs.

Patterson, Jerry L., and others. *Productive School Systems for a Nonrational World.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986. 123 pages. ED 274 028.

In the rational model for operating an organization, goals are logically defined and mutually compatible, decisions are made at the top of the organizational ladder, and the activities of all individuals within the organization are directed toward achieving the desired goals. According to Patterson and associates, many people believe that the rational organization describes how "schools *should* run and how the best ones *do* run." However, the authors assert that "the former is not possible and the latter is not true."

Claiming that the rational model is inappropriate to a world in which change is the only constant and to schools, which must meet the conflicting demands of a host of constituencies (parents, students, teachers, and others), Patterson and associates offer what they call a "nonrational model" as an alternative. Their model is based on six assumptions:

1. "Goals can be multiple, competing, contradictory, ambiguous, and promoted by a variety of interest groups."
2. "Decision-making is closely tied to goal definition" and decisions may be the result of compromise among conflicting interests, rather than the result of applying logic to arrive at the solution to a problem.
3. Effective power may reside with virtually anyone in the organization, instead of being concentrated at the top.
4. The external environment (the community in which the school is located) is unpredictable and affects the decision-making process.
5. "There is a range of situationally appropriate teaching methodologies."
6. "The connection between policymaking and classroom instruction is tenuous and loosely coupled."

When applying this model at the school level, Patterson and his colleagues suggest that radical changes in curriculum or teaching techniques are unlikely to accomplish much. The key to improved teaching and learning, in their view, is for the principal to thoroughly understand the school's climate and to work with staff and students over time to modify those elements in the climate that are counterproductive.

Perry, Roger H. "The Organizational/Environmental Variables in Staff Development." *Theory into Practice*, 19, 4 (Fall 1980): 256-

61. EJ 241 442.

Claiming that, for the most part, "staff development programs do not drastically change a teacher's classroom behavior," Perry analyzes the problem and offers some solutions. The thrust of his argument is that most such programs operate in a vacuum--they teach general principles while failing to take into account the particular environment (classroom, students, administrators, community) that largely determines what and how a teacher can teach. Consequently, when an individual leaves a staff development program and returns to the classroom, he or she may well discover that what was learned in the program has little to do with the immediate practical problems that a teacher must face.

Perry identifies four kinds of staff development programs that actually can help teachers to better understand the environment in which they teach and to use that understanding to improve their teaching. The Issues Seminar Model identifies interest groups in the community where the teacher works and analyzes what they value and what kinds of decisions they are likely to make that affect teaching. Ethnographic studies provide a teacher with information about interactions within his or her particular school. Organizational development programs provide ways for teachers, administrators, and students to work together to identify problems and decide how to solve them. And joint programs with community organizations help teachers to improve their community relations skills and better understand the concerns of the community in which they teach.

Rosenholtz, Susan J. "Teacher Experience and Learning: Do All the Good Die Young?" 29 pages. (Unpublished paper obtained from the author.)

Rosenholtz hypothesized that organizational factors within the school might play a major role in determining the extent to which teachers could learn on the job. To test her hypothesis, she examined survey data collected from three categories of teachers: (1) those with five years or less of experience, (2) those with six to ten years of experience, and (3) those with eleven to fifteen years of experience.

She found that organizational factors accounted for 60 percent of the variance among inexperienced teachers' perceptions of their learning, 67 percent of the variance among moderately experienced teachers, and 72 percent of the variance among experienced teachers.

Rosenholtz also found that those organizational factors affecting teachers' perceptions of their learning varied from one category of teachers to the next. Thus, effective school management of student behavior was more important for beginning teachers

than it was for more experienced ones. Fair and meaningful teacher evaluation was more important for moderately experienced teachers than for either inexperienced or experienced ones. And the importance of collaboration among teachers seemed to increase with teacher experience.

Perhaps the most important finding to come out of Rosenholtz's study is that, in learning-enriched schools (those that provide strong organizational support for teacher learning opportunities), teachers continue to learn throughout their careers. If this is the case, then individual schools can counteract the current trend toward teacher stagnation and burnout by marshalling their resources to provide teachers with a learning-enriched environment.

Rosenholtz, Susan J. *Teachers' Workplace: A Study of Social Organizations.* New York: Longman, forthcoming.

What effect, if any, does organizational context have on teaching and learning? To find answers to this question, Rosenholtz first collected quantitative data by surveying teachers from eighty-five schools in Tennessee. She then interviewed a number of the teachers who took part in the survey.

Rosenholtz found that teachers frequently engaged in collaborative activities--working together to improve their teaching--in those schools where they felt certain about instructional practices, where they shared common values, and where they were actively involved in technical decision-making. Rosenholtz also found that, in these same schools, teachers viewed the principal primarily as a resource person and identified teacher leaders as those teachers who were inspirational and freely made their expertise available to other, less experienced teachers.

According to Rosenholtz, the extent to which teachers consider learning to teach to be a continuous, never-ending progress depends largely on the setting in which they teach. Teachers from collaborative settings tend to think of learning about teaching as a continuous process and tend to improve in the practice of their profession throughout their careers. In contrast, teachers from isolated settings tend to think of learning about teaching as a process that ends within two or three years after one begins to teach. Such teachers tended to level off in the practice of their profession within a few years after beginning to teach.

In the interviews that Rosenholtz conducted, teachers from collaborative settings generally expressed the view that problems with children were learning problems that could be solved if the root causes were identified. In contrast, teachers from isolated settings generally expressed the view that such problems were discipline problems that could best be solved by punishing the

child.

Not surprisingly, Rosenholtz concludes that the organizational context of teaching, teacher commitment, and teacher morale are all interrelated; she hypothesizes that all three have an impact on student learning.

Rutherford, William L. "Teachers' Contributions to School Improvement: Reflections on Fifteen Years of Research." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 1986.

Rutherford claims that, for the most part, the commonly accepted practice of promoting educational reform through changes mandated from above and targeted at entire schools or school districts simply has not worked: "Much money, much time and much professional effort has left a very paltry legacy." He believes that one of the major reasons for this failure is the tendency on the part of educational reformers to treat teachers as "passive recipients of change"--that is, to bombard teachers with a continuous stream of mandated changes and to do so without consulting with the teachers who must actually implement those changes.

Rutherford suggests two distinct ways to solve this problem. One is to recognize the importance of the individual teacher in implementing change and to consult with individual teachers before those changes are implemented--identifying teachers' concerns and making sure those concerns are addressed. The other, more innovative, approach suggested by Rutherford is to "establish conditions within the organization that encourage teachers to become the initiators and facilitators of change." Put another way, Rutherford suggests that administrators, instead of devising changes themselves and mandating that teachers adopt them, should concentrate more on encouraging teachers to become the ones who identify what needs to be done in the classroom and to initiate those changes needed to accomplish it.

Sanders, Annette, and Watkins, J. Foster. "Organizational Climate Changes over Time: Another Look." *Educational Forum*, 47,2 (Winter 1983): 191-98. EJ 275 683.

Sanders and Watkins attempted to replicate an earlier study by T.N. Taylor testing the hypothesis that, over time, relatively open school climates tend to become even more open, while relatively closed school climates tend to become even more closed. To do so they analyzed Organizational Climate Description Questionnaires returned by administrators and teachers during the years 1966, 1971, and 1977 (the ones from 1966 and 1971 had formed the basis of Taylor's study).

In the authors' study, as in the earlier one by Taylor, schools originally categorized as open moved toward a more closed climate, whereas those originally categorized as closed moved in either direction at random.

The studies by Taylor and by Sanders and Watkins do not necessarily suggest that an open school climate cannot be maintained over time. The authors point out that, through much of the period covered by the studies, the district in which they were conducted was beset by turmoil generated by desegregation, labor strife, and state enactment of educational accountability laws. Hence, it is plausible that the authors' findings merely point out the human tendency, when faced with a high degree of uncertainty, to take refuge in that with which we are familiar. And that with which most schools are familiar is the closed organizational climate.

Schmuck, Richard A. "The School Organization and Classroom Interaction Once Again: School Climate." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March 19-23, 1982. 13 pages. ED 221 932.

Schmuck's paper offers considerable encouragement to those educators who hope that changes in school climate can have a positive effect on student achievement.

The author briefly reviews studies done during the late 1960s and early 1970s that led many educators to believe that forces outside the school's control--socioeconomic status, family attitudes, and the like--were so powerful that the school climate was a negligible factor in student achievement. He counters by discussing *Fifteen Thousand Hours*, a study by Rutter and associates of twelve schools in London's inner city conducted over a three-year period. Although none of the schools was involved in special programs entitling it to resources not available to others, the authors discovered significant differences among schools in student achievement. They attributed these differences to variations in the schools' characteristics as human social systems--academic emphasis, interaction among teachers and between teachers and students, and the like.

Schmuck supplements Rutter's findings with his own account of his experiences observing two junior high schools where a new curriculum module was being implemented. One junior high was characterized by distant, formal relationships between principal and teachers, among teachers, and between teachers and students. The other was characterized by closer, more informal relationships. In the former school, the curriculum module was a dismal failure; in the other it was very successful.

Schmuck concludes by suggesting that, although none of the studies supporting the importance of school climate are extensive enough to be definitive, they are significant enough to mandate considerably more research in the area.

Schmuck, Richard A. and Schmuck, Patricia A. "The Cooperative Classroom and School Climate." (Forthcoming as a chapter of *Handbook of Cooperation in Education* under the title "Social Organization and Classroom Climate"). 10 pages.

According to the authors, "the school's climate, in all of its complexity and variability. . . sets the stage on which classroom interactions are played out." The Schmucks describe four kinds of factors--norms, roles, structures, and procedures--that play important roles in determining the kind of climate a school will have.

The norms of a school define the kinds and ranges of behaviors that meet with approval, disapproval, or indifference on the part of the school community. Roles are norms defining how people in particular school positions should interact with one another. Structures are norms about how roles are assigned among a variety of jobs. And procedures are "the actions taken through the structures."

The Schmucks argue that norms of cooperation can best be developed in a school when the principal first introduces formal structures that encourage cooperation--teacher committees that have a significant voice in decision-making, for example. As teachers become used to working in cooperation with one another, they will develop norms of cooperation that will be reflected in their classroom activities. Eventually, cooperative patterns of activity can become the norm for interactions among students, between students and teachers, and between teachers and administrators.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "Instructional Supervision: A Research Agenda for the Future." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, March 31-April 4, 1985.

Sergiovanni offers a two-pronged agenda for future research in instructional supervision. The first is research examining "the implications and effects of recent and emerging state mandated educational changes on supervisory practice and commensurate learning and teaching." The second is research seeking "to scientifically match existing and evolving technologies and practice models to unique professional practice situations."

Granting that state guidelines in curriculum, teaching, and

supervision have their uses, Sergiovanni cautions that, carried too far, those guidelines can deprive supervisors of the flexibility they need to cope with the unique problems they face. He advocates establishing a research program that would serve as a "watchdog" to protect against the top-down implementation of programs that may do more harm than good.

Sergiovanni argues convincingly for technologies and practice models that emphasize the "it depends" approach over the "one best way" approach. He compares research in instructional supervision to an architect's book of house plans. The architect uses the book of plans as a "cognitive map" to help design a *unique* house best suited to a *particular* client's needs. Similarly, a supervisor draws upon research in instructional supervision to develop *unique* practices best suited to the *particular* needs of his or her teachers and students.

Sirotnik, Kenneth A., and Oakes, Jeannie. "A Contextual Appraisal System for Schools: Medicine or Madness?" *Educational Leadership*, 39,3 (December 1981): 164-73. EJ 256 400.

Asserting that programs for school reform are unlikely to be effective unless they are based on a sound understanding of the individual school, Sirotnik and Oakes offer a framework for identifying and analyzing contextual variables that have an effect on teaching and learning. The authors identify four contextual domains: Personal (self), Instructional (the classroom), Institutional (the school), and Societal (perceptions about schooling and its functions). They also identify four classifications of individuals who interact with those domains: students, teachers, parents, and observers (administrators and program developers).

Sirotnik and Oakes acknowledge that their framework is incomplete and needs to be adapted to each school on an individual basis. Yet they convincingly maintain that studying the interactions between the four classifications of people and the four contextual domains can help educators to identify and meet the needs of a particular school.

Tibbetts, Sylvia-Lee. "Whatever Happened to Teacher Autonomy?" *Journal of the NAWDAC* (National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors), 42, 3 (Spring 1979): 8-13. EJ 204 176.

What happens when a supervisor introduces a "Programmed Reading Program" without bothering to consult the reading teacher? And what happens when that program prescribes every step the teacher is to take during the course of her working day? In this particular case, the reading teacher resigned in disgust after one year.

Tibbett's article should not be read as an indictment of innovative teaching programs in general or innovative reading programs in particular. Nor should it be read as a plea for absolute teacher autonomy in the classroom. Rather, it should be read as a plea for allowing teachers a part in the decision-making process when educational innovations are being considered. And it should also be read as a plea for allowing that level of teacher autonomy which enables them to use their professional judgment in solving the specific problems they encounter in the classroom.

Tucker, Marc, and Mandel, David. "The Carnegie Report--A Call for Redesigning the Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68,1 (September 1986): 24-27. EJ 341 129.

Tucker and Mandel claim that schools cannot effectively perform their tasks unless two objectives are accomplished: (1) a "rational and fair incentive structure" must be developed to focus the entire school on educational outcomes that are in the public interest, and (2) teachers must be given "a much greater degree of trust and responsibility."

To accomplish the first objective, the authors advocate much greater differentiation in teacher pay and responsibilities than is currently the case. Citing the practice in the medical and legal professions, the authors urge that, as teachers gain more experience and demonstrate more expertise, they should be granted more complex and important teaching roles and should be paid accordingly.

To accomplish the second, Tucker and Mandel would have school districts grant individual schools considerably more latitude in designing curriculum, school organization, and classroom instruction. For example, instead of having all students assigned to predetermined class times in specified courses, teachers might meet periodically to determine how best to divide up the students among themselves. Teachers who are especially adept at working with children who have serious learning problems might be given release time to make them more accessible to such children throughout the entire school.

The authors claim that their proposal would not lead to "management without leadership." On the contrary, with more decisions being made at the building level and fewer at the district level, the need for strong principals would be greater than ever.

Wagner, Laura A. "A State Perspective on Teacher Leadership Roles: The Potential of the California Mentor Teacher Program." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational

Research Association, San Francisco, April 16-20, 1986. 14 pages. ED 272 964.

To assess the potential of the California Mentor Teacher Program, Wagner used data obtained from the 1985 Survey of Mentor Program Implementation conducted by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, from case studies conducted by the FWLERD, and from discussions with individuals involved in implementing the project.

Wagner found that, as is to be expected of an innovation introduced on such a wide scale, it took a substantial amount of time for the program to begin to function in the way in which it was intended to. Thus, most school districts initially viewed the program as an opportunity to get extra work out of some teachers in return for extra pay; it took time for administrators to see the program as a means of identifying teacher leaders and giving them an opportunity to exercise their leadership. Similarly, in the initial stages of the program most mentors worked primarily on curriculum matters; it took time for the typical mentor to feel comfortable working with other teachers to improve their instructional skills. Wagner also found that districts with a tradition of commitment to staff development and school-based improvement could generally implement the program more easily than could those districts without such a tradition.

Watson, Pat, and others. "The School Makes a Difference: Analysis of Teacher Perceptions of Their Principal and School Climate." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, March 31-April 4, 1985. 40 pages. ED 266 529.

Watson and colleagues report on the results of an eighty-two item survey given to teachers in ninety-four schools in Oklahoma City. Although the primary purpose of the survey was to give principals feedback on the ways in which they were perceived by the teachers who worked under them, it also served to identify characteristics of principals that most influenced teachers' perceptions of them.

According to the authors, the two factors that accounted for 85 percent of the variance in teacher perceptions of principals were "treats staff with respect" and "is open and friendly."

The authors do not claim to draw any conclusions about the relationship between teacher perception of principal effectiveness and effective teaching per se. Nevertheless, the study would seem to lend considerable support to the view that an effective learning environment is one characterized by close working relationships between the principal and the teachers.

Wells, Kim. "Teacher Socialization in the Educational Organization: A Review of the Literature." Paper presented at convention of the Western Speech Communication Association, Seattle, February 18-21, 1984. 25 pages. ED 242 668.

According to Wells, a review of the literature on teacher socialization shows a consensus on two main points: (1) individuals entering the teaching profession move from liberal and progressive views at the time they first become interested in teaching to more traditional views by the time they have become established in the profession, and (2) the primary factors influencing such movement are schools of education, bureaucracies in the schools where such individuals begin teaching, and role models.

West, Carol Ann. "Effects of School Climate and Social Structure on Student Academic Achievement in Selected Urban Elementary Schools." *Journal of Negro Education*, 54,3 (Summer 1985): 451-61. EJ 320 608.

Concerned about the increasing disparity between basic skills test scores of urban school children and those of children from suburban schools, West conducted a study to see if correlations could be found between school climate and social structure on the one hand and academic achievement on the other. She studied school climate questionnaires returned by third- and sixth-grade teachers in the Paterson, New Jersey, school district and correlated the results with data from the New Jersey Minimum Basic Skills test for students from those same schools.

She found that instructional leadership on the part of the principal, teacher experience and education, and parental involvement in the school's structure all had significant relationships with student achievement. Reading achievement was highest in schools where the teachers perceived that the principal had high expectations of the students, where parents were involved in the schooling of their children, and where teachers had considerable education and/or experience. Math achievement was highest where principals provided instructional support for the staff and where basic skills were emphasized.

Wise, Arthur E. *Legislated Learning: The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979. 219 pages.

Government at the state and federal levels has become actively involved in setting educational policy for the public schools to achieve two kinds of goals: (1) to provide equal educational opportunity for all students and (2) to make schools more effect-

ive and efficient. Wise maintains that state and federal intervention to achieve goals of the first type is necessary and can produce results, whereas intervention to achieve goals of the second type is not only unlikely to produce the desired results but will have the undesirable side effect of leading to "further centralization and bureaucratization of education."

Wise suggests that problems of inequity (racial discrimination, allocation of resources, and the like) arise out of conflicts at the local level between those who have power and those who do not. Consequently, local school boards--responding to the demands of those who possess power--are unlikely to solve such problems. It follows, in Wise's view, that the state and federal governments have necessary roles in ensuring equal educational opportunities for all.

In contrast to problems of inequity, however, problems of effectiveness and efficiency are technical in nature and do not lend themselves to resolution at the state and federal levels. Wise maintains that current technology does not provide the means to determine desirable educational outcomes, the means to measure such outcomes, or the means to determine how to achieve them. Nevertheless, if the state and federal governments become involved in mandating specific educational outcomes, they will inevitably focus on those that can be measured (otherwise, there would be no way of knowing whether the desired outcomes have been achieved). In response, individual school districts would concentrate on those educational outcomes mandated by the state and federal governments--even though they may have little or nothing to do with the needs of the students. The net result, Wise suggests, would be the loss of local control over the schools and a decrease in teacher autonomy and professionalism--without any guarantee that improved learning would result.

Wise concludes by arguing that the state and federal governments should limit their roles in setting educational policy to what they can do best--ensuring equality of opportunity. Control over the actual operation of the schools should revert back to local school boards: "Efforts to improve educational productivity can and should continue at the institutional level."

ERIC®

ERIC Clearinghouse
on Educational Management
College of Education
University of Oregon
1787 Agate Street
Eugene OR 97403

(503) 686-5043

NCREL

North Central Regional
Educational Laboratory
295 Emroy Avenue
Elmhurst IL 60126

(312) 941-7677